[President.]

matter. I am mentioning all this for the purpose of showing that there are still many grounds for concentrating upon and not losing sight of the development of our ports. The conclusion to be drawn from all these circumstances is that there is considerable room for the improvement of the Travancore ports and for making them efficient places for export and import. Government are therefore paying special attention to Alleppey and Quilon and are likely to pay special attention also to Leepuram, of which mention has been made. The trouble, however, in regard to Quilon has already been referred to in the debate. The trouble is that unlike Alleppey there is no mud bank and therefore there is no shock absorber against the terrific onslaught of the surf and the current which on that part of the coast are very excessive. The pier therefore can be considered only side by side with other expedients like groynes for the purpose of checking the force of the surf. The construction of the pier originally undertaken at a particular estimate was, on further consideration, found to present more difficulties than at one time seemed to be likely to confront this Government on account of the additional precautions that have become indispensable. The cost has therefore increased. It is that and that alone which has made a certain amount of delay in this matter.

The motion was thereon with drawn.

The Demand was then put to vote and carried.

The grant was made.

DEMAND XVIII - EDUCATION —GRANT TO TRAVANCORE UNIVERSITY.

DR. K. L. MOUDGILL: I move under demand XVIII for a grant of Rs, 8,25,000 to the University of Travancore.

Motion Nos. 1 to 3.

MR. P. NARAYANA PILLAI :

1. To omit the allotment of Rs. 82,24,000 for grant to the Travancore University

MR. P. NARAYANA PILLAI :

2. To omit the allotment of Rs. 8,25,000 for grant to the Travancore University

MR. P. NARAYANA PILLAI :

3. To omit the allotment of Rs. 8,25,000 for grant to the Travancore University

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI: I submit that the motion is out of order because either it should have been a motion for reduction of one rupee or it should have been a motion for a omission of the whole allotment for the Women's College. It is neither of them and therefore is evidently a motion which is out of order.

MR. PUTHUPPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI: Motions 1, 2 and 3 are inadmissible

PRESIDENT: I should like you to elucidate the matter.

MR. PUTHUPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI: A motion for omission of an alotment is unlike a cut motion, a substantive motion, that is a principle merely stating that no allotment need be made, under a particular demand. Here this is intended to be discussed as a cut motion. (1) to

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

discuss the desirability of abolishing the Women's College, (2) to discuss the desirability of introducing compulsory military training in the Colleges and (3) to discuss the desirability of giving due importance to the Malayalam language. They are all cut motions, but the motions as they are framed are really substantive motions for omission of the whole allotment and therefore they are not admissible here as cut motions to be discussed.

PRESIDENT: Is there not any rule where a token motion is to be given in the programme?

MR. PUTHUPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI: There is provision for a reduction motion—a motion which is sought to be a deduction—which should be a nominal sum not exceeding Rs. 5.

PRESIDENT: As a matter of legislative procedure and in order to focus attention on particular topics, the practice current both in Parliament and in the Indian Legislatures is to adopt a token motion as an expedient. But neither Parliament nor the Indian Legislatures have negatived the possibility of an honourable member saying that there should be no provision for the University. Is there anything against it under the Rules?

MR. PUTHUPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI: There should be—

PRESIDENT: What I want from the honourable members is this: There has been no rule in any Legislature to the effect that it is open to this House to say for instance that there should be no grant for the University. What is done elsewhere is that token motions are first entered in the Agenda paper and the motions for grants entered afterwards as is well known during the debates.

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI: That was the practice here also.

PRESIDENT: Is objection taken to the order in which motions are printed on the ground that token motions should come first. In that case, it only wants a re-distribution.

MR. PUTHUPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI: The real substantive objection is not in regard to the place where it is put in but in regard to the form itself. A motion for omission is a substantive motion that no allotment be given and under that a censure or token motion cannot be discussed.

PRESIDENT: The point is this: Supposing he had not adopted a somewhat roseate procedure and brought in the womens' College. Then perhaps he would have been alright. What has apparently happened in this case is, that the honourable member has started with the idea that some kind of subject should be entered to indicate the object of each motion. Strictly speaking, the portion in brackets is either misleading or supererogatory. The statements in brackets is only an indication given by the member that that is the matter on which he is going to speak. From that point of view he is at liberty to discuss the motion.

MR. PUTHUPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI: You, as President, are at liberty.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

PRESIDENT : Order. Order. I am asking you whether the portion within brackets is to be considered only as guidance to Government member or is a part of the motion itself.

MR. PUTHUPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI : Sir, in the papers supplied to the honourable members, it will be noticed that in respect of the motion no place is provided in the motion sheet for indicating the object of the motion. But in regard to token motions there is a place. You have directed in your ruling that the members should give a guidance of the object of the token motion. So the reasons alleged here may not be ignored. In any case motion No. 1 could not be admitted. The motion is for the omission of the total allotment.

MR. KAINIKARAI M. PADMANABHA PILLAI : So far as the motion is concerned, there is nothing preventing a member from moving for the omission of the total allotment. If Mr. Narayana Pillai had merely asked for the omission of the total allotment without indicating the subject, I would not have objected to that. But what I say is that Mr. Narayana Pillai will not be comptent to discuss under this motion the question of the abolition of the Women's College.

PRESIDENT : I think what Mr. Narayana Pillai proposes to say—I am going to hear him—is that the Women's College should not be allowed to continue perhaps because they are still keeping up that edifice.

MR. P. NARAYANA PILLAI : Sir, I propose to say exactly what you have indicated.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI : Sir, I wish to bring to your notice another aspect of the question. If this is allowed and the matter is pressed to a division then the whole amount will be removed from the budget.

PRESIDENT : The matter is one of some importance. Although in this particular case there is no accute trouble, I think the main question has to be decided. Usually token motions will have to be given precedence in the agenda for the reason indicated by Mr. Velayudhan Pillai. Both as a matter of convenience and as a matter of principle, those questions which can be dealt with in detail and as to which a deduction can be made might be more conveniently dealt with because if a token motion were carried, it might also affect the final cut motion. The order of printing is a matter of procedure for which the member is not responsible. So, now and hereafter, if there are token motions and also motions for the total omissions of the grant the token motions will take precedence.

Now, I will come to the present motion. As I said, it is not possible to discuss any particular question like the desirability of abolishing the women's College or introducing compulsory military training in the colleges in connection with the omissions of the total grant. A total omission is not a token motion in the sense that particular matters are formulated and canvassed. From that point of view all these statements, such as "to discuss the desirability of abolishing the Women's College" become superfluous and are really inadmissible in the reduction of the total grant. Subject to this, I held that it is open to a member to move for the omission of a total grant. But he will be allowed to do so

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

only after the token motions are discussed. It will also be clearly understood that a particular administrative reform or procedure or the way in which University affairs, might be improved may be mentioned only in passing. It will be a vote of censure and not regarded as a desire for bringing about improvement in the affairs of the University.

The token motions will now proceed. The next motion stands in the name of Mr. K. Kunju Panikkar.

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI: Sir, I rise to a point of order. I do not say that there is any thing against this motion in the Assembly Rules. But I must say that this is a subject which is entirely academical and which we must normally leave to the authorities of the College. It is a matter in which even the University authorities ought not interfere. Therefore consistently with the principle you laid down the other day, I submit that this is not a subject which might be discussed with benefit on the floor of this House. So I request for a ruling for our future guidance.

MR. K. KUNJU PANICKER: Sir, when a member sent an interpellation relating to the University, you pointed out that since the University is an independent body with which the Government, as such, has nothing to do, answer will not be given. You also suggested that at the time of the cut motions a member may point out the policy which should influence the University. This is something which we, the members of the House, want to point out to the authorities of the University for their guidance in the choice of the candidates.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: Sir, whatever may be the rules and procedure governing the administration of the University we are governed by section 17 and Rule 28 of the Legislative Reforms Act. Specific cases are given there in which we are prohibited from discussing certain matters. This matter is not included in the categories enumerated there. Anyhow we are asked to sanction Rs.8,25,000 as grant to the University. According to the honourable member who raised the objection, we cannot put any interpellation or discuss any cut motion regarding administration of the University. When that point is raised the Chair observed that it would be more appropriate if any particular matter is brought to the notice of Government and the Chair by means of a cut motion. But now Sir, when that course is adopted by another member, that is also objected to on the ground that the University is an autonomous body. I am at a loss to understand the logic of this. If both the methods of asking questions or tabling cut motions which are permitted under the provisions of the Statute cannot be availed of, by the members, I fail to understand any other way open to us for bringing to the attention of Government the vagaries or irregularities that may be committed by the University authorities. Sir, is it not just and proper that we should get the information by means of answers to questions and motions, which may enable us to decide whether the grant to the University should be sanctioned or refused. So my opinion is that the House should have the honour to discuss the administrative policy of the University.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI: In other words we are now called upon to vote Rs. 8,25,000 for the University. We cannot do anything, except saying yes or no. I think that is the position which we have come to.

PRESIDENT: The question has been raised and it will be my duty to lay down the principles which will guide not only the relations of this House with the University but also with other self-governing institutions like the Municipalities. Now, there are Legislative Rules and there are conventions governing the conduct of the legislative bodies. The work of the legislative body does not solely consist in implementing or working out the rules as they stand in the statute or under the rules and standing orders. The work or the activity of a legislative body includes and connotes the establishment of certain healthy conventions, which guide the work of the legislative *vis a vis* other bodies. There is no doubt that excepting where a matter is *sub judice*, there is no objection to certain matters connected with the courts of justice being discussed in a legislature. Nevertheless, throughout the world, wherever parliamentary institutions have come into existence, a convention has sprung up of trying to avoid discussions of detail in matters pertaining to the judiciary as apart from discussions of principle. I am going to ask the assistance of this honourable House in the matter of laying down analogous conventions in the case of statutory autonomous bodies like the Municipalities and the University. These corporations are guided by their own statute and statutory bodies and authorities whose constitution and powers are based upon the same principles which have brought the legislature into existence. It cannot be lost sight of that the University has a Senate, in which there is nominated as well as popular element wherein the principle of election also plays apart. The Senate in relation to the University stands in the same position as the Legislature in relation to Government. It must be said that it is a parallel body to the Legislature, though of course, of less importance from the point of view of the general administration of the country in the body politic. That being so, I hope it will be conceded that the proper mode of approach and the function of this body to the activities of the University would be that this body will exercise and not relinquish its right of exercising very close superintendence over the financial transactions and the policy of the University. What I was at some pains to establish during my preceding remarks was, that it would be the right procedure for this body to establish a precedent according to which, academic matters, nominations to specific appointments and small matters of detail, where after all autonomy becomes indispensable and is given to these bodies, are not to be interfered with. To the extent to which this body exercises its right of saying that in its opinion the University has not acquired or deserved the support of this body in the matter of grants because on such and such a matter of principle on which, not as an academic body but as a body of public men, versed and instructed in public affairs, this body has come to the conclusion that a particular expenditure or a particular policy is not sound, it may express its desire or even record

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

its censure. My ruling would therefore be that whilst there is no statutory prohibition against the discussion of the financial details in the University Budget or the policy of the University, yet it is advisable on all grounds and from many paramount considerations, that this body should establish a convention not to interfere with or discuss details of the academic procedure of a body which is essentially academic and is composed of academic experts but to confine itself to those large questions of policy in which this House as well as the Senate have a parallel and concurrent jurisdiction and equal modes of expression of opinion and equal facility and opportunities for getting that inside knowledge on which alone that opinion should prevail. In other words, I am pleading to this House for the establishment of that convention by which only principles will be discussed and not matters of detail. From that point of view I hold, and I trust that this House would support me in that ruling that, questions like the admission of particular students or particular communities is a matter which should be left to the discretion of the University. And inasmuch as the matter is the establishment of a convention, I should like to have the opinion of this Honourable House on this matter, namely whether they are willing to establish a convention. I want the opinion of the Honourable House whether they are willing to discuss matters like those comprised in motion numbers 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 whether they regard them as matters of principle and are willing to discuss them or whether they are matters of detail which should be left to the discretion of the University.

The question that discussion on the motion numbers referred to above be allowed was put to vote and lost.

PRESIDENT: The question before the House is that a sum of Rs. 8,25,000 under Demand XVIII—Travancore University be granted.

The motion was put and carried.

The grant was made.

MR. MURUKUMPUZHA V. KUNJUKRISHNAN: Sir, I wish to make an appeal to the Chair. Now a ruling has been laid down and the House has accepted the position enunciated from the Chair and the Demand relating to the University has been approved by the Legislature.

PRESIDENT: The honourable member is not entitled to make an appeal after the grant has been made.

MR. MURUKUMPUZHA V. KUNJUKRISHNAN: I do concede that. I wish to explain my difficulty over this point. Now a ruling has been given to us to the effect that the Legislature and the Senate are two parallel bodies. Matters of detail connected with the University will be attended to by the Senate and the general principles if any may be discussed here was the understanding that has been come to.

PRESIDENT: I will clarify the point. I said and adhere to the opinion that there is no statutory inhibition or prohibition against such discussion. But I wanted to know whether this House was willing to establish a convention which I referred to and that is why instead of giving the ruling on the matter I wanted to be fortified by the opinion of the Honourable House which I have obtained. Now, the Honourable member may proceed.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. MURUKUMPUZHA V. KUNJUKRISHNAN : Our opinion has been taken. I accept that position. I wish to bring to the notice of the House this one fact. The university is an autonomous body constituted under a special Statute. When the University was constituted, several branches which were in the purview of discussion of this Assembly have gone over to the University. Latterly, several other public institutions such as the Fisheries Department, Public Health Department etc. have been added on. This is a matter which affects the interests of all the subjects of His Highness the Maharaja. As far as this Assembly is concerned there are certain constitutional safeguards provided.

PRESIDENT : I may interrupt the honourable member to this extent In so far as the University is entrusted by Government with the duties which are not within the four corners of the University Statute, if the University as a public body takes up on itself extra duties which normally devolve upon a department of Government, to that extent, University will be fulfilling functions of a department, of Government and will be susceptible to the same treatment and to the same budgetary and other procedure as other department of Government. Supposing the function of the Public Service Commissioner were handed over to the University then of course the moment the University is bold enough to take up that function, from that moment the University will be subjected to the same financial and budgetary scrutiny as the Public Service Commissioner. The University has taken upon itself the running of the Fisheries Department as an agent of the Government and has been entrusted with the duty at a matter of financial or administrative prudence or expediency. It will be within the jurisdiction of the House to examine all details in regard to the work on Fisheries. What I am concerned to point out was that to the extent to which the University is purely an academical body to that extent, not by ruling or by Statute but by convention, this House shall not interfere.

MR. MURUKUMPUZHA V. KUNJUKRISHNAN : What I want to point out is this. The motion of Mr. Kunju Panicker was to discuss that certain sections of His Highness' subjects find it impossible to get admission into our colleges by the rules made in that behalf. That was the matter that was sought to be discussed. The ruling is that for the time being this matter will be considered and decided by the Senate which consists of certain academic experts. The University Senate and Syndicate as it is constituted at present I am afraid has not got sufficient safeguards like the Legislature. There is difficulty to get representation for a vast majority of His Highness' subjects either by election or by nomination. I shall try to clarify that position. The first time when the University was brought into being, Government had the power of nominations to that body. Therefore members of certain communities like the Ezhavas, Muslims, Nadars and certain other educationally backward communities of the different section of the public, were nominated to that body. You may be aware of that fact by means of University Statute. In the present Senate, there is not even a single Ezhava. In the Syndicate there is the Mayor of Trivandrum. As far as the Muslim representation is concerned, there is the Inspector General. All these have taken place by means of nomination. I have

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

no quarrel over this matter. I do not plead for any communal elections there. All that I say is that there is such inequality. It has to be admitted on all hands that educationally backward communities cannot get representation either in the Senate or Syndicate. It is a very difficult task. Some communities have no colleges, no schools and the number of graduates is also very few. It would be rather impossible for them to send a member there by election. As for nomination, according to the Statute, the number of seats available with Government is limited. You may be aware of the list of the members in the Senate and Syndicate this year. Such being the case, I have no quarrel with the members of the Senate or the Syndicate. All those bodies consist of acadamic experts. All that I admit. At this juncture when we are living in an atmosphere of communal bias, is it proper, is it safe to give this entire right of financial and administrative jurisdiction in the hands of the Syndicate and the Senate.

I do not plead for communal representation. It is a fact admitted on all hands that educationally backward communities find it very difficult to get representation in the Senate as at present constituted. Some of the communities have no high schools or schools even and the number of graduates amongst them is very few and it will thus be impossible to get a representation. The number of seats available are very few. A list by communal war of the Senate and Syndicate members will make that position very clear. I have no quarrel with the members of the Senate or Syndicate. When we are living in an atmosphere of communal bias, is it safe to give this entire right in the hands of the Senate and Syndicate? All the interests are represented in this House. At this juncture when the whole University budget is to be discussed and approved, we have to very sympathetically consider and come to a conclusion on this matter.

MR. K. G. GOVINDAN: If this is the attitude of the House as is indicated by the decision already arrived at, does the member think that any useful purpose will be served by bringing this demand here?

MR. MURUKUMPUZHA V. KUNJUKRISHNAN: Yes, the voting result would show that almost all the members except the officials and members of the Senate voted for the motion.

PRESIDENT: I should not like any convention to be established hastly even on a matter which is said to be essentially a domestic or what may be called an internal matter of the University. If there is any real feeling in the House that there is much more balanced opinion than is disclosed by the actual voting, I am perfectly prepared to suggest to the official members that they should refrain from voting and be guided by the result of the voting of other members. There is much to be said on both sides. I do not wish that certain communities should feel that in the Senate or the Syndicate they are not properly represented and that they have no voice in those bodies and that therefore what may be called the great policy of the University should be discussed

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[President.]

on the floor of the House and the opinion of the House recorded. while I cannot deprive the members of their legitimate rights, I do not know whether it will be convenient or expedient to do so. If any honourable member feels that the official vote has upset the balance of the voting strength of the House, I have no objection to be guided by the opinion of the House. I am willing to allow further discussion on the matter and the members might decide for themselves after hearing such discussion.

MR. MURUKUMPUZHA V. KUNJUKRISHNAN: I pray that I should not be misunderstood when I say this. This is a matter which will very seriously affect the interest of certain communities especially the Ezhavas. I am one of those who is concerned with the educational advancement of the community. In 1114 we had about 300 Ezhava students in the Arts College. But the number is only 175 or 200 in the technical Colleges Sir, I shall point out by facts and figures that the Ezhavas do not get practically any admission. I wish to make an earnest appeal to you, Sir, because you are one of those who are responsible for saving us from the social disabilities that we had been suffering for age long and we are obliged for the noble part you have played in the promulgation of the world famous Temple Entry Proclamation. While we are grateful to you for what you have done to remove the social disabilities, we pray that you should not be a party to reduce the individuals to educational or economic slavery.

PRESIDENT: I had asked the opinion of the House as to whether it wishes to discuss these things or not. Apparently a complaint is made that the decision was really brought about by the vote of the official Members. I do not want that kind of reproaches levelled. If the honourable members want further discussion I am not going to rule it out. It was not a statutory ruling but the House decided not to discuss certain notions on the agenda paper.

MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI: One very great difficulty presented to me in the course of the remarks by the Chair, and that is Sir, you have unequivocally declared that a discussion of the University Budget is not statutorily prohibited. That is the fundamental position. Now I ask whether this majority vote can go against that fundamental right. A motion of mine may be out-voted, but my right to discuss the Budjet can not be a matter of vote.

PRESIDENT: It is not a question of right or law, but of a convention. A convention can be implimented in various ways. For instance in the Parliament when such questions come up, somebody gets up and moves that the House do pass on to the next item. Everybody knows why that motion is made and agrees. It is one thing to have the right to discuss the matter and quite another not to do so actually by supporting some member who moves that the House pass on to the next item. Parliament for instance insists on its right to discuss a certain matter. The matter is brought in a certain form. But the Parliament makes up its mind not to discuss the matter as a matter of practice.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI : By a vote of this House a motion can be determined. But to move a motion is a right conferred upon a Member by the statue of our legislature. No convention can seek to supercede this right. A convention may be in furtherance of a statutory right, if it is not provided for expressly. Should a convention over-ride the statutory right? I am not concerned with the merits of the convention whether it is good and healthy. A lot of confussion has crept in. Suppose I move a motion. It is up to the House to throw it out by a majority. And it passes on to the next item. When we are going to the University budget as you Sir pointed out, a motion may be moved and voted upon to pass on to the next item in the Agenda. Again it is for the House to decide to discuss the University Budget or not.

PRESIDENT : There is no question of interference with any right. Supposing, for instance, an examination takes place in the intermediate or B. A. The results are declared and only 20 per cent have passed. All the rest have failed. Examiners report on the matter, the Syndicate considers it and the University declares its verdict. Then is it or is it not open to this House as a matter of law to object to the grant for the University saying that the examination was very strict and the percentage of pass was very low? Would it be possible to discuss the nature of the question papers, the qualification of those who set the question papers, the kind of valuation, the possibility of the question papers being known to the students beforehand and all those things. I am only putting an extreme case to judge the possibility of this matter.

MR. K. KUNJU PANICKER : I wish to point out the probable repercussions out side this House about the sort of the debate in this House.

PRESIDENT : We cannot help it.

MR. K. KUNJU PANICKER : The University Budget was put before this House and we are not allowed to discuss and vote the grant. How are we to discuss and ventilate our views, we are at a loss to understand. By the sort of procedure adopted now we feel that we cannot touch the University Budget and influence their policy by any means. In the governing body of the University, *i. e* in the Senete, most of the communities cannot get representation. Communal feeling still subsists in the country and certain communities are still suffering on account of the historical economical or other reasons. If we cannot influence the present University by such discussions we shall be more comfortable if the Government would take up the responsibility of conducting the University rather than governed by a Senate, in which most of the communities are not represented. I beg to point out that the Chair should take a lenient view of the suggestions put forward by this House about their right to discuss.

MR. S. CHATTANATHA KARAYALAR : Sir, there are certain statutory bodies constituted under the Travancore University Act namely the Senate, the Syndicate and the Faculties which can deal with specific

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. C. Chattanatha Karayalar.]

matters and which are competent to come to their own definite conclusions on those matters. Then supposing on the matters that are sought to be raised and discussed under these motions, this House comes to certain conclusions and on the same matters the University bodies come to different conclusions, then the decisions of this House will come into conflict with those decisions. Then, how can the statutory bodies constituted by the University Act function.? That will create a difficult situation. So I suggest that those matters which can be legitimately dealt with by the University bodies should, as a matter of convention, be excluded from the discussion of this House. I suggest for the consideration of this House that this may be laid down as a convention.

MR. KOTTALIL P. ABRAHAM : Now this House has voted on motion No. 3. " To omit the allotment of Rs. 8,25,000 for grant to the Travancore University to discuss the desirability of giving due importance to the Malayalam language." I wish to know whether this House is precluded from raising the matter on another occasion ?

PRESIDENT : Certainly not.

MR. KANNANTHODATH JANARDANAN NAIR : Sir, on a point of order. It was decided by a vote of the House that the motion for the total omission of the grant should not be moved. But the statute of this Legislature empowered it to consider and vote the grants. May I know whether this House is entitled to take the privilege of that provision in the Statute ?

PRESIDENT : As I said, a convention could be established, and that convention is not derogatory to the statutory authority of the House. It may even be a standing convention. But grievous cases may arise. Supposing the University ceases to function or, for that matter, supposing a Municipality which does not function for a number of years but insists on grants to be paid by Government, it is open to the Government to say that they propose to interfere in their affairs. Parliament has made such exceptions. Even in the University Act, provision has been made for an enquiry to be ordered by Government in the affairs of the University but the extraordinary powers are not to be used lightly. In Great Britain, Royal Commission may be appointed and are appointed to investigate momentous and large issues, but even there the urge has generally come from the Universities themselves. However, in view of the complaints made by some honourable members on the floor of this House, I am not going to regard as final what this House has decided, because I am, in the last degree, loath to bring into the discussion under University grant or any other grant, questions of communal justice or injustice which have been raised in the course of the debate. No honourable member of this House should be in a position to feel that a particular community or group of communities have not had a chance for looking into the affairs of the University as other communities or, that motions are being passed over their heads the idea of taking into count the official vote can be given up.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

DR. K. L. MOUDGILL : I think, Sir, it is fairly clear that your intention in placing the matter before the House was to see whether the House would be prepared to enter into a self-denying ordiance not to go into the details of the work of the University and impose upon itself restrictions when matters of the University are taken into consideration. When the point is established, that this is merely a matter of convention and that there is no need to enter into practical details, I agree to reconsider the position so that no honourable member of the House should have a feeling that even the self-denial was agreed to by some of the honourable members of this House without each member being fully alive to the significance of the convention.

PRESIDENT ; Does the honourable member remember the discussions which arose when Cecil Rhode made a donation to the University of Oxford and the question raised in the House of Commons with regard to the extent to which the House of Commons could interfere with the details of the disposal of the donation.

DR. K. L. MOUDGILL : I have heard about them, Sir.

PRESIDENT : Speaking, subject to correction, the Universities of Oxford claimed that they were a body which came into existence anterior to Parliament, and they had themselves brought into existence certain schools, colleges and foundations by virtue of powers given by charters and prior statutes. Strange though it may sound, they were suspicious of offers of grants because they argued that under the guise of giving grant to the University the House of Commons and the Government of England were seeking to interfere with the internal autonomy of the Oxford University. The House of Commons, as a matter of convention, does not interfere with the internal affairs of the University and the question of grants is left largely to a standing committee of the Treasury. Block grants are made without earmarking the objects. That is my recollection. But the matter must be looked into further.

DR. K. L. MOUDGILL : With regard to the difficulties which Mr. Karayalar has raised I must say, Sir, that he has raised an important question. It is for the honourable members to consider whether this House should ever put itself in a position to come into conflict with other statutory bodies like the senate of the University.

MR. K. KUNJU PANICKER ; May I know whether there is anything contradictory in giving a suggestion as to the policy which may be adopted by the University ?

DR.. K. L. MOUDGILL : No, provided that the suggestion is not backed up by a cut. With regard to actual cut motions I must say, that a large number of these lie directly within purview and the initiative of the Senate. It is hoped that the Senate will be in a position to take up the discussion of those policies. So far as the University is concerned, if the House agrees to impose upon itself a sort of self-denial and restriction to distinguish clearly between matters of policy and of detail, I think, there is no harm in taking up some of these matters

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Dr. K. L. Moudgill.]

and, even today, to resume the discussion on the basis of general policy. Matters of details should not be introduced. Therefore, I suggest that if the House wishes to discuss these matters, those discussions may be allowed. In the course of the discussion it should be made possible for any honourable member to move that we pass on to the next item on the agenda. If the House feels that the matter has been discussed adequately it may accept the motion. The object of the members will be served and yet the House will gradually establish traditions in support of the convention which has been suggested by you.

PRESIDENT : I do not think that this will work satisfactorily.

MR. N. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI : Sir, may I suggest that we may be given some time to study the matter as it is a very important one.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI : Sir, the Deputy President of this House made some observations regarding the difficulties that may arise on account of both this House and the University Senate coming into conflicting decisions on the very same matter. Sir, I have considered this matter and I feel that there may not be any difficulty in that direction, because even according to the statutory provisions governing this House any motion passed by this House will not bind Government. It is deemed to be only a recommendation made to Government by the House. Sir, in so far as we are giving a certain amount by way of grant to the University, and in so far as our University is not exempted from the purview of the Legislature under Section 17 and Rule 28 my considered opinion is that we may be allowed to discuss cut motions relating to the administrative policy of the University. The decisions arrived thereon will be deemed only as recommendations to Government. The Government may then be pleased to consider the matter and take the necessary action on such decisions so that the Government grant is properly used in accordance with the legitimate aspirations of this House.

MR. S. CHATTANATHA KARAYALAR : Will it not amount to a sort of pressure upon Government, however mild it may be ?

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI : No. It should not be deemed to be a pressure to bear upon Government. If this House is enabled to discuss a particular cut motion, it will come to a decision on such matter and this decision need be deemed only as a recommendation made to Government by this House. Government may inform the University of the decision of this House.

PRESIDENT : Very, well, I see your point.

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI : Sir, one point which I wish to make clear at the very outset is that there has been no attempt on the part of anybody to make it impossible for the House to do any of its functions or to rob it of any of its powers.

MR. K. G. GOVINDAN : Then what was the effect of the voting of the House ?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI: The effect of the voting must have been fully in the minds of the members who voted. It was a decision arrived at by this House. It was not in the form of a ruling from the Chair. The House itself can think of the matter and say "We do not propose to deal with the matter." That was what happened. If the House is of the impression that that vote was rather hastily given and they want the position to be reconsidered, then it is open to you, Sir, to allow them to vote again and decide the matter. Anyhow, I do not wish the House to have the impression that I am in any way less anxious than any other member to safeguard the interests or the powers of this House.

Sir, here the motions thrown out include motions for omission of the grant and motions for reduction of one rupee. There is no intention to prevent the House from throwing out the total grant. There is no intention to prevent the House from moving motions for reductions of one rupee. The only point that I wish to place before the House is whether the House must have the right or rather exercise their right to go into the details of the working of the University or not. My suggestion is that the House might fully utilise their powers for moving motions for the omission of the grant and for the reduction of the grant so long as the House is satisfied in criticising general principles and policies. When you come to matters of detail, my suggestion is that the House should not go into them. The first motion before the House for instance is a motion regarding admission to colleges. I may say, Sir, that that is exactly the type of a subject into which this Assembly should not go.

MR. MURUKKUMPUZHA V. KUNJUKRISHNAN: Suppose the motion is that 50 percent. of the admission to the college classes should be reserved to the educationally backward communities. Does it relate to the general policy?

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI: It is much more an academical question than a question of general policy.

MR. MURUKKUMPUZHA V. KUNJUKRISHNAN: May I know whether there is such a provision in the Madras University rules as regards admission to the college classes?

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI: Sir, I am not aware of such a provision there. If there is such a provision it is fundamentally wrong.

MR. MURUKKUMPUZHA V. KUNJUKRISHNAN: May I know whether a sub committee has been appointed to advise them in regard to admissions?

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI: I am not aware. What I want to say, Sir, is that in the matter of admissions, I would go a step further and say that even the University authorities should not interfere in that. Even the Senate and the Syndicate should not interfere in that. It is a matter which should be left to be decided by the head of the institution, namely, the Principal of the college,

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. Kainikkara M. Padmanabha Pillai.]

according to the advice of the Board of Studies. Taking, for example, the college of Science, I would say that admission to it is a matter to be left to the Principal of the College of Science helped by the professors for the particular subjects and advised by the Board of Studies for Science.

MR. K. KUNJU PANICKER: By such a process may I know whether the effect of the reservations made here in regard to admission to backward classes will be nullified?

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI: I am not prepared to admit the position, Sir. Again, taking the case of the Engineering College, the principles of admission should be left to the Engineering College authorities and the Board of Studies in Engineering. It is only when we find that the college authorities are committing irregularities that the Syndicate or the Senate itself must go into the question. Therefore, Sir, to have it dragged even beyond the University authorities and have it discussed on the floor of this House will, I think, be an unhealthy interference with the day to day activities of the University.

Sir, it was stated that without discussing the matter on the floor of this House, public opinion cannot be brought effectively to bear in the working of the University. I think that even there, the House is rather making a hasty judgment. Sir, the Syndicate and the Senate contain elected and nominated representatives. The Senate includes members of this House as well as the members of the Sri Chitra State Council.

MR. MURUKKUMPUZHA V. KUNJUKRISHNAN: How many Ezhava members are there?

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI: The University Calender is a public document and the member can look into that.

MR. MURUKKUMPUZHA V. KUNJUKRISHNAN: Being a member of the Senate will the honourable member kindly give the names of the Ezhava members in the Senate?

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI: I do not think, Sir, that a member of the Senate is bound to give such information. This House has sent its representatives and if the public has got anything important to be brought to the notice of the University, I say that it can easily be done through the members who have been sent to the Senate from the public bodies and through the Senate to the other University authorities and that there is no necessity to bring the matter here.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: Suppose from the Administration Report we find that the number of students who passed from the Arts College is very poor, and I wish by moving a cut motion to bring to the attention of the Government that the teaching in the Arts College is very poor, am I permitted to do that?

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI: Under the convention that the House has been pleased to adopt, it is not permissible,

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI: What does the honourable member say with regard to the honourable member Mr. V. Kunjukrishnan's difficulty that his community is not being represented in the Senate to safeguard their interests?

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI: Sir, I must say that Ezhavas are represented not only in the Senate but even in the Syndicate. Mr. M. Govindan was a member of the Syndicate from its very inception. After the expiry of his term, Mr. C. O. Madhavan became a member of the Senate and also of the Syndicate.

MR. K. G. GOVINDAN: Was Mr. Madhavan appointed there because he was the Mayor of the Corporation?

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI: No, Sir he was nominated, cent per cent. in his personal capacity.

MR. P. SIVARAMA PILLAI: May I know whether the Mayor is an ex-officio member of any of these bodies?

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI: No, Sir. Moreover in this case he became a member of the Syndicate before he became the Mayor.

PRESIDENT: I find that already an hour and twenty minutes have elapsed and there is only forty minutes more for the discussion of the demand.

I think that all things considered and having regard to the importance of the subject itself and the fairly strong feelings that have been evinced by various speakers, the best plan for the House and there again I shall ask the House to vote on the matter—would be to go on discussing these grants without prejudice to the decision of this question on which much more thought has to be bestowed than has been bestowed till now, because, frankly speaking, the matter came up on the spur of the moment. Merely because I had some memory of the discussion in the House of Commons, I appealed for a convention and asked for the opinion of the House. Some of the honourable members apparently believe that sufficient thought had not been bestowed on the question and I am therefore perfectly prepared, if this honourable House so decides, to proceed on the basis that without prejudice to the discussion of this question of principle, for the time being, we may proceed with the discussion of this grant. The whole question is whether the honourable House is prepared to adopt that line. The official members will not vote.

Some Honourable Members: We shall proceed on that basis.

PRESIDENT: It must be distinctly understood at this stage that, having regard to what has happened the ruling to the extent to which it has gone, the appeal for the convention to the extent to which it has gone, while it may stand on the rolls and the records of this House, will not be taken as binding this House to a definite decision one way or the other, until another opportunity is given to this House and to the Chair—to the House to put forward its point of view and to the Chair to give its ruling. On that basis, the House will now proceed with the motions.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Motion No. 4.

MR. K. KUNJU PANICKAR: Sir, I move—

MR. S. CHATTANATHA KARAYALAR: Sir, I rise to a point of order. The Demand has already been put and voted upon and the motions on that Demand cannot be moved now.

PRESIDENT: After all, it is open to the House to come to the conclusion that a previous vote was a snatch vote or a vote in which it did not express its will. If there is any doubt about it, I shall put that to the vote. If a vote has been taken in ignorance or by a misapprehension of what really was meant, then the House can certainly go back on that vote. There is nothing against doing that in the rules or the standing orders.

MR. K. KUNJU PANICKAR: Sir, by this motion I beg to point out certain grievances. By the historical causes and by a long course of events which were transpiring in Travancore certain important and numerically superior classes and subjects of His Highness the Maharaja were prevented even from entering the Government schools and colleges. This was done by the established policy of the Government. It was only very recently that all classes of His Highness' subjects were given universal admission into schools and colleges. By the policy of Government, certain important sections and communities among the subjects of His Highness the Maharaja were denied the elementary right of getting themselves qualified for Public Service and other useful activities of life. So also by a long course of conduct, most of these communities were not even allowed to enter the Public Services. Recently by the agitation of the aggrieved communities and by the sympathetic policy of the Government, the Government allowed all communities admission into the schools and colleges and the Public Service. Now, when the admission into the Public Service is definitely formulated under the orders of the Government, there arises an important question of getting qualified hands from important communities. The situation is that, if, for a certain appointment, a particular University qualification also is indispensable and if the communities who were denied educational facilities are prevented from getting academic qualifications by any general principles adumbrated, I submit that those communities will have to stand aloof and forego their claims even in the Public Service. So I beg to submit or rather to point out one important feature. Formerly, Police Inspectors, Excise Inspectors and so many other important officers could discharge their duties without having even the qualification of a graduate and they were discharging their duties efficiently, as we all know. Now by the present policy and tendency of the people, innumerable graduates, graduates-in-law and persons possessing other qualifications including European qualifications are to be seen among the members of the various privileged communities in the land. We have got so many persons—influential and wealthy with greater qualifications, with qualifications which are not quite required for places such as the Police Inspector, Excise Inspector, Tahsildar and so on. Those people come

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

and say—You see that "We are England returned. We have got so many qualifications. That man of Backward Community has got only the qualification of the Travancore University or the Madras University; and so let that man be denied his right and let us be given the chance of going in for his place because we are better equipped with education". Of course, they are better qualified—

PRESIDENT: Order, order. I do not know whether the honourable members are aware that persons returning from England are not guaranteed any right as a matter of fact. Directions have been issued to Departments to the effect that no preference need be given to any foreign degrees. It has been laid down as a specific rule and the rule is being enforced rigorously.

MR. K. KUNJU PANICKAR: What I wish to say is that if a person from a certain community possesses the minimum qualification and if he is entitled by communal rotation to get a place for study or in service then the minimum qualification should be considered as sufficient. With reference to technical education also, I submit that the minimum qualification should be considered as the standard for admission of that person to the University or technical education. Only thus members of certain backward communities can get themselves qualified and get admission into the technical branches of Public Service. It is to safeguard such interests, Sir, that I point out that particular attention should be bestowed to the amenities and convenience of certain classes of people in the matter of selection to courses of technical studies. Unless some such consideration is given many people with better qualifications in the privileged communities will knock off all the places and the backward classes with the average and minimum qualifications will be deprived of their rights. In order to prevent such a state of affairs, the necessary policy should be laid down by the Government or should be adopted by the University. The majority of the Senate members being privileged class men may ignore this course. Among the Senate members there may be persons who may have this view, but may not be bold to suggest or press such communal claims due to so many causes. Anybody who is putting forward a communal claim may be looked upon with a sort of scornful eyes. I say certain people are not thus prepared to press and some others hesitate to point out their communal rights. Some may consider it is out-of-fashion to emphasise communal rights. So, Sir, I submit that when such delicacies are standing on the way of Senators, and the Senators from these backward people being few and far between, we should be allowed to press this point in this House so that it may be brought to the pointed attention of the Government, who in turn may bring it to the notice of the Senate and the Syndicate of the University. It is with this view that I move this motion.

MR. K. G. GOVINDAN: Sir, I support the motion. In supporting the motion, I may be permitted just to make some passing reference regarding the broad policy of the interference of this legislature with the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. K. G. Govindan]

University. Sir, this House is asked to make a grant of nearly 8 lakhs of rupees to the University. My humble submission is that the House must necessarily have a right to make some suggestion atleast regarding the government of the University. Sir, you made the other day a reference to Sir Ashutosh Mookerjee how he instituted a Tibetan chair and afterwards assistant professors, and when the matter was questioned, how he answered that question by instituting a Chinese chair &c and how finally he had to resign. So I gathered that in the fight between the University and the Government, Government finally succeeded, that is to say, Government established- - -

PRESIDENT: Others would say that it was the Government that yielded. The Hon'ble member may know from the History of Lord Lytton, how Sir Ashutosh declined to come back as Vice Chancellor and how he still ruled the Uneversity and later his son accepted the Vice-chancellorship and continued the tradition of his father.

MR. K. G. GOVINDAN: Sir, with due respect to the House, I must say something about the method of voting that occurred.

PRESIDENT: Order, order. We cannot talk over the whole business and discuss the matter again and again.

MR. K. G. GOVINDAN: There was a ruling by the Chair that we should discuss broad principles and when the question was put to the House whether questions Nos. 5 to 11 could be discussed upon, the House said "no" and when the House was asked whether quetions Nos 1 to 4 could be discussed, then also the House said "no".

PUTHUPALLI S KRISHNA PILLAI: On a point of order, Sir. A motion is before the House and the member's statement should refer only to the motion before the House.

MR. K. G GOVINDAN: My submission is only this. Questions Nos. 1 to 3 contain very broad principles,

PRESIDENT: Order, order. The motion before the House is to discuss about the policy of giving admission to the various college classes and courses of studies, and the Hon'ble member will confine his attention to that.

MR. K. G GOVINDAN: I strongly support the motion.

MR. MURUKUMPUZHA V. KUNJUKRISHNAN: I wish to support the motion. The point that I wish to mention to this House is that in the matter of admission to the colleges, 25% of the places allowed to each college is reserved with the Principals concerned for providing for members who were not admitted to the examination. Now, Sir, I shall try to illustrate this position by certain concrete examples. The Engineering College was started three years ago. In the degree course, every year 21 students are admitted. Last time I think during the Budget Session, 30 interpellations were answered from which you would find that in 1114 only one Ezhava was admitted to the degree course and one Muslim who is not a native of Trivandrum was admitted and all the others were from other castes which are educationally advanced.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

In 1115 also only one Ezhava was admitted although I know that there were several applicants who have passed the Intermediate Examination in the First class with distinction. So far as this year is concerned, the facts and figures are not available although I have asked for information about the admissions to the Engineering College. I shall make my position clear. For making the selection there is a selective test. For the degree course, applications are called for. When students with advanced educational qualifications apply they are not taken. Only students who have got a degree are taken. Several people from the advanced communities have been selected. My only submission is that provision should be made for those communities who are backward in point of education.

As far as admission to the Science College is cocerned--

PRESIDENT. Will the Pro-Vice-Chancellor be able to say whether there were applications from the Ezhava community?

DR. K. L. MOUDGILL. Sir, there were no such applictions for the Degree course in the Engineering College.

MR. MURUKKUMPUZHA V. KUNJUKRISHNAN: The board of studies lays down some rules and the rules are supposed to be carried out. But in fact when admissions are actually made we find that the students from backward communities do not get any admission or sufficient admission. I say this not on communal basis only. Suppose a man is staying in Trivandrum. If his son does not get admission he will not be able to send him elsewhere Therefore on the ground of poverty also this question must be considered. At least 50 per cent of the admissions should be reserved with the Principal for admitting such students. Even in Madras this question arose. There were complaints from Muslims, non-Brahmins and Scheduled Classes to the effect that they did not get sufficient number of places in the College classes. The question was enquired into by the Madras Government. A committee was constituted and as a result of their recommendations the admission was regulated. Recently the committee was abolished but complaints arose and it was again reappointed. Similarly something must be done here also. As I pointed out a few minutes ago owing to the restriction in the matter of getting admission into the Colleges the educational advancement of the communities is seriously affected. Among the Ezhava community, till about four years ago the number of admissions was on the increase. But now the number is going down. I hope the Pro-Vice-Chancellor will enquire into the matter. Now there are 63 students for the degree course in the Engineering College, According to rotation that has been fixed, out of 63 students there will be only 2 Ezhavas. What is the effect of it? The rotation has been fixed for the appointment of supervisors But they are denied admission to the Colleges. There is a belief among the people that if they apply they will not get admission to the Colleges.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

PRESIDENT : What are the restrictions under the rules ?

MR. MURUKKUMPUZHA V. KUNJUKRISNAN . A competitive examination is held. Last year from the Ezhava community, two candidates who had passed the Intermediate in the first class with distinction, had also applied. There was some *viva voce* examination or something of that sort.

DR. K. L. MOUDGILL . I hope the honourable member is not suggesting that the examiners of the University were prejudiced. If he is suggesting that I will have to protest against it most emphatically.

MR. MURUKUMPUZHA V. KUNJUKRISHNAN . I think my honourable friend has misunderstood me. All that I am saying is that there are several reasons why my community is backward. But why cannot some provision be made for us? Is it not the intention of His Highness the Maharaja in creating this University that all the subjects of His Highness are benefited by it? If this restriction is made what will be the effect of it? Why should the people be eliminated from the University course ? Therefore my only submission is that this is a matter which has to attract the very serious attention of Government. I know that the Government have explained the other day about the University. I also appeal to you, Sir, as Vice-Chancellor to exercise the influence you have got in the matter and to see that something is done.

MR. N VELU ACHARY : സർ, ഞാൻ ഈ ഉപക്ഷേപത്തെ അനുകൂലിക്കുന്നതോടുകൂടി ഗവണ്മെൻറിനേറയും യൂണിവേർസിറ്റി മേധാവികളുടേയും ദയാദൃഷ്ടിയിൽപ്പെടുന്നതിനു രണ്ടു വാക്കു പറയുവാൻ ആഗ്രഹിക്കുന്നു. സർ, ലോകമെങ്ങും പേയിട്ട്യാറിസം നടമാടുന്ന ഇക്കാലത്തു നമ്മുടെ പൊന്നുതമ്പുരാൻ തിരുമനസ്സിലെ കാരുണ്യാതിരേകത്താൽ സിദ്ധമായ ഇവിടത്തെ യൂണിവേർസിറ്റി അതിൻെറ പരിപാവനമായ ഉദ്ദേശം വിശേഷിച്ചും അവശസമുദായത്തോടു ദയാപുരസ്സരം നിർവഹിച്ചില്ല എങ്കിൽ അതിൽപരം കഷ്ടം മറെറന്താണെന്നു ഞാൻ ചോദിക്കുന്നു. വിശ്വകർമ്മ സമുദായം മഹാരാജാവുതിരുമനസ്സിലെ പ്രജകളിൽ ഒരു പ്രധാന വിഭാഗമാണെന്നുള്ള വിശ്വാസത്തോടുകൂടിയാണു് ഞാൻ ഇപ്രകാരം പറയാൻ നിർബന്ധിതനായതു്. കഴിഞ്ഞതവണ യൂണിവേഴ്സിറ്റി മേധാവികൾ എത്രമാത്രം സത്യസന്ധതയോടും കൃത്യനിഷ്ഠയോടും മഹാരാജാവു തിരുമനസ്സിലെ അഭിലാഷത്തെ ആദരിച്ചു പ്രവർത്തിച്ചു എന്നുള്ളതിനു് ഒരു സംഗതി പറയാം. കഴിഞ്ഞ സെലക്ഷനിൽ എൻജിനീയറിംഗ് ഡിഗ്രി കോഴ്സിൽ ചേർന്നു പഠിക്കുന്നതിലേക്കായി വിശ്വകർമ്മ സമുദായത്തിൽനിന്നും ഒരേ ഒരാൾമാത്രമെ അപേക്ഷിച്ചിരുന്നുള്ളൂ. അവർതന്നെ പരസ്യംചെയ്തപ്രകാരം അതിനു വേണ്ടതായ എല്ലാ യോഗ്യതകളും ഉണ്ടായിരുന്ന ആളായിരുന്നു. അങ്ങനെ അപേക്ഷിച്ചിരുന്നതു്. എൻജിനിയറിംഗ് സംഗതിയിൽ വിശ്വകർമ്മസമു

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

ദായത്തിനു ജനനാലെതന്നെ പ്രത്യേകം വാസനയുണ്ട്. ആ സമുദായത്തിൽപ്പെട്ട ഒരംഗത്തിനു് അതിൽ—നമ്മുടെ നാട്ടിലെ യൂണിവേർസിറ്റിയിൽ പ്രവേശനം ലഭിക്കുന്നില്ലെന്നുള്ളതു വളരെ സങ്കടകരമായ ഒരു സംഗതിയാണു്. പഠിച്ചു് ഉന്നതിയിൽ വരാനായി ശ്രമിക്കുന്നവരുടെ ഗതിയെ തടയുന്നതു് ഒരിക്കലും ശരിയല്ല. ഇങ്ങനെ കാളേജിലേക്കും മറ്റുമുള്ള പ്രവേശനംതന്നെ തടയപ്പെട്ടാൽ പിന്നോക്കസമുദായക്കാരുടെ ഗതി പിന്നെ എന്താണെന്നു ഞാൻ ചോദിക്കുന്നു. ഗവണ്മെൻറും യൂണിവേഴ്സിറ്റി മേധാവികളും സഹൃദയബുദ്ധിയോടുകൂടി അവശസമുദായങ്ങളുടെ വിശേഷിച്ചും വിശ്വകർമ്മജരുടെ രക്ഷയ്ക്കു വേണ്ട സഹായം ചെയ്തുകൊടുക്കണമെന്നുള്ള അപേക്ഷയോടുകൂടി ഞാൻ ഈ ഉപക്ഷേപത്തെ ഹൃദയപൂർവം പിൻതാങ്ങുന്നു.

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI: Sir, I regret I have to oppose the motion. Even while speaking on the admissibility of such motions I pointed out as illustration the inadvisability of bringing this motion under the purview of the Assembly. The reason adduced in support of the motion is that now the principle of communal rotation has been accepted for the public service, it also means that hands should be available to fill those places, and therefore admissions should be given to those communities in the Colleges. It certainly is a mathamatically correct position that if the students are not admitted into the Colleges they will not be available for service. If that is the argument pushed to its logical conclusion, it will mean that the availability of the candidates for the recruitment depends not only upon admissions to the Colleges but also upon promotions. If the principle is acccpted in order to satisfy the demand from the different communities and if we are to adjust admissions to the Colleges accordingly, then we have to accept the second position also and see that the results of the examinations also accord with the demands of the different communities.

It would be a very pathetic state of offairs if we are forced to a position namely that results of the University must be governed by communal rotation. It is one thing to say that a community must have its share of appointments provided there are candidates: but it is entirely a different thing to demand that Universities must make it possible for the communities to have an easy path through the college classes and legally equip themselves—not academically, but legally-with the necessary qualifications for entrance into the public service.

MR. MURUKKUMPUZHA V. KUNJUKRISHNAN: Is the member aware that in the I.C. S. examination a certain percentage has been set apart for communities who are not capable of getting selection by means of open competition?

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI: Sir, that is purely nomination, seats are reserved for nomination.

MR. MURUKKUMPUZHA V. KUNJUKRISHNAN: In the case of admissions to the college may I know, what is the criteria to be fixed? Is it the case that those who have secured best marks alone should be admitted? Could not 50% of the seats be reserved for those members of the backward classes who have not got the adequate number o fmarks?

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI: Admissions are made according to merit. Admissions are given not to communities but to students based purely on the merit with which they have passed their previous examination. If we are to control admissions it is indirectly controlling the results of the previous examination. If you decide to control the results of the previous examination, the question will come, why not control the subsequent examinations also. For example in the Science College the admission for the B.Sc., degree course is to depend on the marks obtained for the Intermediate examination. If therefore you are to control admission into the B. Sc. class depending upon communal representation and not on marks it would tantamount to controlling the result of the intermediate examination. The natural question would be why not control the results of the B. Sc. examination also. So if this principle is adopted it would mean the adoption of communal ratio, both for the admissions and for promotion.

MR. K. G. GOVINDAN: May I know whether any demand was made here by anybody that the principle of communal repesentation should be followed with regard to promotion or for deciding results in examinations?

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI: What I said was very clear. When the argument is put forward that for the purpose of supplying the necessary number of candidates for appointments in the public service, admission to the colleges has to be governed by communal representation, the next inevitable logical conclusion will be that the number of promotions will also have to be governed by communal representation.

MR. MURUKKUMPUZHA V. KUNJUKRISHNAN: Is the member aware that in Madras a concession has been made to members who could not get admission merely on the merit of marks obtained in examinations?

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI: I am prepared to be enlightened by the Hon. member's question. But at the same time Sir, before studying the consequences of the application of that rule, I am not prepared to give an opinion on the subject.

MR. MURUKKUMPUZHA V. KUNJUKRISHNAN: Is the member aware that such a rule is in force in Madras for the last so many years?

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI: I am prepared to accept that information. But I am not prepared to give an opinion on it because I do not know the effect of the working of the rules there.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Therefore, what I say is, under the existing conditions the University will have certainly to adhere to the principles so far followed in the matter of admissons.

A special reference was made about the College of Engineering in regard to admissions. The fact is that as the head of our Engineering College we have a gentleman of unquestionable character who goes into matters with an earnestness almost unequalled. In those matters even the University authorities do not interfere. So far as I have been able to study things, I can say that admissions have been given in the best interests of the students and the college and the community at large.

MR. K. KUNJU PANICKAR: May I know whether in the matter of admission to that college, selection was made according to the highest marks of the students who appeared for selection?

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI: Yes. The Principal sets a special written examination and the selection is based on the mark obtained in the examination and also in a *viva voce*. These examinations are conducted by persons of unquestionable ability and character.

Therefore I think that this motion is a move in the very wrong direction, especial y at the initial stages of the University. We are very jealous that the highest standards must be maintained. We are hearing of negotiations between this Government and the Government of the neighbouring State and proposals for that State also coming into the University especially in the matter of the Engineering branch. When we are trying to extend the jurisdiction of the University and bring into its fold the colleges of the neighbouring State, the reputation of the efficiency of our University should be jealously safeguarded. I request the hononrable members to view the whole thing not merely from the narrow interests of communities but in the interests of the University at large. At least we should allow the existing rules to work for a considerable time and think of making this kind of modification only after the University has established itself.

MR. P. SIVARAMA PILLAI: Sir, I am sorry I have to oppose the motion as it is worded. I would only request the honourable members of the House to remember that our University was brought into existence just 3 or 4 years ago and it is an infant University. Under the present circumstances, we have to maintain a high standard and status. In the case of a technical subject, like Engineering the standard should be still more higher than other subjects. In the Uuited Provinces there are five or six Universities. But the Benares and Roorkil Engineers are preferred to the graduates of other Universities. That is due to the high standard of education given in those Engineering Colleges. This is a fact to be born in mind, if we keep up high standards I believe we will be able to attract students from outside Travancore and as I said, unless a high standard is maintained in the branch of technical education, we cannot justify the existence of the Engineering College. That being the case I belive that acceptance of the principle of communal standard representation in the matter of admissions cannot hold good. High standard and efficiency should be our prime motive.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. MURUKKUMPUZHA V. KUNJUKRISHNAN : May I know whether anybody here advocated communal representation in the matter of admissions ?

MR. P. SIVARAMA PILLAI : I am sure that, that was the motive behind the motion. Acceptance of that principle in the matter of admissions to technical colleges will certainly stand in the way of higher standards being kept up.

MR. K. KUNJU PANICKAR ; May I know whether any minimum marks could be fixed up as the standard for getting admissions in the Colleges ?

MR. P. SIVARAMA PILLAI ; Yes, certainly.

MR. P. KUNJUKRISHNAN ; Sir, I am at one with all the sentiments expressed here by my friend Mr Kunjukrishnan. There are very many handicaps for the educationally backward communities to be remedied. Mr. Kunjukrishnan referred to the instance of reservation of seats in the Madras Colleges. In Madras 25% of the seats have been reserved for educationally backward communities so far as admission to the college is concerned.

Now Sir what I want to submit is that it is a sort of reservation for certain educationally backward communities up to a certain stage. It is admitted on all hands that a high standard of efficiency has to be kept up and it is also admitted that the spirit of communalism should not come in here. It is not on account of the narrow interest of communalism that this proposition is brought forward. It is to see that all sections of the people are in a position to enjoy the benefits that are drived from the University. In the matter of keeping up highest standards of efficiency in tact, my friend referred to the instance of two first class Ezhava students having applied for admissions in the Engineering College and their inability to get admission. But students who passed in the second class and who belonged to some other community were in a position to get admission. Without casting any reflection on the head of the Engineering College I may be permitted to state one fact.

PRESIDENT ; The time for the grant is over.

The motion that Government be granted a sum of Rs. 8,25,000 under Demand XVII—Travancore University was put to vote and carried.

The grant was made.

DEMAND XIX—EDUCATION EXCLUDING TRAVANCORE UNIVERSITY.

MR. A. GOPALA MENON : Sir, I rise to move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 43,14,901 under Demand XIX—Education excluding Travancore University.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly